REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-4, 6-9, 11-16, 18, and 20-23 remained pending in the application during the Final Office Action mailed September 25, 2007. Claims 1-2, 5, 10, 17, and 19 have been previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Claim 7 is newly cancelled in this response. Claims 8, 11, 21, 22, and 23 are currently amended. Claims 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 are New in this application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11-16, 18, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindhorst et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,889,379 (hereinafter Lindhorst), in view of MacFarlane et al., U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0042081 (hereinafter MacFarlane). Claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindhorst in view of MacFarlane and further in view of Masters, U.S. Patent No. 6,374,200 (hereinafter Masters).

Independent claim 21 has been amended to include the limitation of "searching the content for the set of associated identifiers and selecting header information corresponding to a subset of the set of associated identifiers, the subset selected based on a detected network condition." Independent claims 22 and 23 have been amended to include similar limitations. The MacFarlane reference refers to paring documents that are to be displayed (e.g., HTML documents). MacFarlane generally discloses a method for eliminating portions of a document that cannot be displayed by a particular device when transmitting the document to that device. For example, if a document includes text and video graphics, it may be that the receiving device does not have an installed application to display the video graphics. Accordingly, the user application identifies which portions of the document are not going to be needed, and the server

can then send only those portions that the user's applications support. Rather than paring a

document based on the functionality of a display device, the present claims are directed to

selecting header information based on a detected network condition and generating an HTTP

header based on that selected information.

Accordingly, applicants assert that MacFarlane does not teach elements of applicants'

independent claims 21, 22, and 23, and these deficiencies are not cured by Lindhorst or Masters.

Therefore, applicants assert that independent claims 21, 22, and 23 are allowable, and dependent

claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 20, and 24-28 are allowable as depending from allowable

independent claims. Applicants respectfully request the rejections under 35. U.S.C. § 103

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in

condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any

matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees

or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

<div style="text-align: right;">

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

</div>

Dated: __October 30, 2007__   By: /Jeffrey R. Joseph/
                                           Jeffrey R. Joseph
                                           Reg. No. 54,204

KENYON & KENYON LLP
600 W. San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA, 95110
(408) 975-7500 telephone
(408) 975-7501 facsimile